arXiv:math/0703522v2 [math.NT] 14 Sep 2007

On the Linear Independence of Roots

Richard Carr and Cormac O'Sullivan

September 12, 2007

Abstract

A set of real nth roots that is pairwise linearly independent over the rationals must also be linearly independent. We show how this result may be extended to more general fields.[1]

1 Introduction

The classic Fermat equation is

$$x^n + y^n = z^n. \tag{1}$$

Consider what happens when the nth powers are replaced by nth roots

$$x^{1/n} + y^{1/n} = z^{1/n}. \tag{2}$$

Let $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ be the natural numbers. We seek solutions to (2) with x, y, z, n in $\mathbb{N}$ and $n \geqslant 2$. For simplicity we take positive real roots and, to exclude obvious solutions, we require that none of x, y, z is a perfect nth power and that $(x, y) = 1$. For example, a computer search with $x, y \leqslant 1000$ and $n \leqslant 10$ yields

$$433^{1/6} + 972^{1/6} = 42089^{1/6} + \varepsilon$$

with minimal error $|\varepsilon|$. It satisfies $0 < |\varepsilon| < 10^{-12}$. Newman shows by elementary means in [12] that, even with possibly differing exponents, there are no solutions to

$$x^{1/m} + y^{1/n} = z^{1/r} \tag{3}$$

for integers $m, n, r \geqslant 2$, with x, y, z in $\mathbb{N}$, $(x, y) = 1$ and x, y, z not perfect mth, nth, rth powers, respectively. This result seems to have been first proven by Obláth [13] and is also considered in [1, 4, 8, 11, 18].

An application of our main result is to the Diophantine equation with positive rational exponents

$$m_1 x_1^{q_1} + m_2 x_2^{q_2} + \cdots + m_n x_n^{q_n} = 0. \tag{4}$$

We are looking for solutions $(m_i, x_i, q_i)_{i=1}^{n}$ with

$$m_i \in \mathbb{Z},\ x_i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } 0 < q_i \in \mathbb{Q}. \tag{5}$$

Here we restrict to real roots, i.e. $x_i^{r/s}$ for $r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ means any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ (possibly positive or negative) such that $\alpha^s = x_i^r$. To avoid trivial cases we also require

$$m_i \neq 0,\ x_i^{q_i} \notin \mathbb{Z} \text{ for each } i \text{ and that distinct pairs of } x_i\text{s are coprime.} \tag{6}$$

We will show in Proposition 4.1 that solutions to (4) satisfying (5) and (6) do not exist. This proposition follows easily from Theorem 1.1 below. To describe it, we first set up some notation.

For any two fields $K \subseteq L$ define the set $\theta(K, L)$ as follows. We have $A \in \theta(K, L)$ if these five conditions are met:

---

[1] **Keywords:** Linear independence, roots, Galois theory

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 11D41, 12F10

(i) $A \subseteq L$

(ii) $|A| \geqslant 2$

(iii) For every $a \in A$ there is some $n_a \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a^{n_a} \in K$. In what follows we always assume n_a is minimal.

(iv) A is pairwise linearly independent over K

(v) If $\mathrm{char}(K) > 0$ then $(n_a, \mathrm{char}(K)) = 1$ for all $a \in A$.

Note that the sets $A \in \theta(K, L)$ may be infinite. What conditions on K and L are necessary so that $A \in \theta(K, L)$ is also linearly independent over K? For real fields the answer is simple.

Theorem 1.1. *If $K \subseteq L \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $A \in \theta(K, L)$ then A is linearly independent over K.*

This may be generalized as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *If $K \subseteq L$, $A \in \theta(K, L)$ and if, for all $a \in A$, L contains no n_ath root of unity except possibly ± 1, then A is linearly independent over K.*

Theorem 1.3. *If $K \subseteq L$, $A \in \theta(K, L)$ and if, for all $a \in A$, K contains all n_ath roots of unity, then A is linearly independent over K.*

Proposition 4.1 is a special case of a result first proved by Besicovitch in [2] using a type of Euclidean algorithm for polynomials in many variables. This proof was extended by Mordell in [10] to allow the m_i and $x_i^{q_i}$ to be in more general fields. Our Theorems 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 provide a new approach to these results. Their proofs are relatively short and include all cases considered by Besicovitch and Mordell, see Proposition 4.2.

A closely related question is to find the degree of the extension over K you get by adding the roots $x_i^{q_i}$. This was also considered in [10] as well as in [4, 15]. Their results are included in Proposition 4.3. Siegel [17] also analyzes this question for real fields. We give a further application to finite fields in Proposition 4.5.

We see from Theorems 1.2, 1.3 that the roots of unity play a key role in these questions. The linear dependence of roots of unity over $\mathbb{Q}$ is an interesting topic. For example Mann in [9] proves that if

$$m_0 + m_1\zeta^{n_1} + m_2\zeta^{n_2} + \cdots + m_{k-1}\zeta^{n_{k-1}} = 0$$

for ζ a primitive nth root of unity, $m_i, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and no proper subsum of the left side vanishing then

$$\frac{n}{(n, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{k-1})} \text{ divides } \prod_{p \leqslant k, p \text{ prime}} p.$$

See also [3, 5], for example.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let n, d be integers with $(n, d) = 1$ and let $\mathbb{Z}_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. Let $\phi : \mathbb{Z}_n \to \mathbb{Z}_n$ be given by $\phi(x) \equiv 1 + dx$ and $i(x) : \mathbb{Z}_n \to \mathbb{Z}_n$ be given by $i(x) \equiv -x$. Then the image of $\{0\}$ under iteration of ϕ, i is $\mathbb{Z}_n$.*

Proof. Let e be the inverse of d so that $ed \equiv 1 \mod n$. Then ϕ is a bijection since $\phi(e(x-1)) \equiv x$. The lemma is trivial if $d = 1$ so assume $d > 1$. Since $(d, n) = 1$, d is an element of the multiplicative group $\mathbb{Z}_n^*$. Suppose d has order r. Now

$$\phi^m(x) \equiv 1 + d + d^2 + \cdots + d^{m-1} + d^m x$$

and

$$(d-1)(1 + d + d^2 + \cdots + d^{r-1}) = d^r - 1 \equiv 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^{(d-1)r}(x) &\equiv 1 + d + \cdots + d^{(d-1)r-1} + d^{(d-1)r}x \\ &\equiv (d-1)(1 + d + d^2 + \cdots + d^{r-1}) + (d^r)^{d-1}x \\ &\equiv x. \end{aligned}$$

Take the combination

$$\begin{aligned} i(\phi(i(\phi^{(d-1)r-1})))(x) &\equiv -(1+d(-1-d-\cdots-d^{(d-1)r-2}-d^{(d-1)r-1}x)) \\ &\equiv -1+d+d^2+\cdots+d^{(d-1)r-1}+d^{(d-1)r}x \\ &\equiv -2+1+d+d^2+\cdots+d^{(d-1)r-1}+d^{(d-1)r}x \\ &\equiv x-2. \end{aligned}$$

So, starting from 0 we get $-2, -4, -6, \ldots$. For n odd we get all of $\mathbb{Z}_n$ this way. If n is even we get the even half of $\mathbb{Z}_n$, $E = \{0, 2, 4, \ldots, n-2\}$. Apply ϕ one more time to get all of the odd elements since clearly ϕ is a bijection between E and $\mathbb{Z}_n - E$ for n even. □

With this lemma in hand, we now proceed to the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof. By hypothesis, A must contain a non-zero element, a. Also 0 cannot be an element of A. If it were, then $0 \cdot a + 1 \cdot 0 = 0$ so that $\{0, a\}$ is linearly dependent. Suppose now, to obtain a contradiction, that A is linearly dependent over K. Then A has a non-empty finite subset which is linearly dependent over K. Let B be such a set of minimal cardinality. Since A is pairwise linearly independent, the cardinality of B is not 2. If B had cardinality 1 then it would have to be $\{0\}$ but 0 isn't an element of A and hence of B. So B has at least 3 elements. Let I index B so that $B = \{b_i : i \in I\}$ and $|I| \geqslant 3$. Let $K(B)$ be the field obtained by adjoining the elements of B to K. This extension may not be Galois. For our proof to work we require a Galois extension since we will later use the fact that an element of a Galois extension of K that is fixed by the Galois group must be in K.

Let M be the splitting field over K of

$$\prod_{i \in I}(x^{n_{b_i}} - b_i^{n_{b_i}}).$$

Then $M : K$ is normal and, because the characteristic of the field is 0, separable. Therefore $M : K$ is Galois with Galois group G. It is clear that $K(B) \subseteq M$. We see that M also contains all n_{b_i}th roots of unity. A short argument, left to the reader (see [7, Lemma 3, p. 198] for example), shows that M contains all nth roots of unity for $n = \mathrm{lcm}\{n_{b_i}\}_{i \in I}$ and a moment's thought reveals that M is obtained by adjoining these roots of unity to $K(B)$. Note too that n is the minimal number so that $b^n \in K$ for each $b \in B$.

There are non-zero $k_i \in K$ such that $\sum_{i \in I} k_i b_i = 0$. Let z be a primitive nth root of unity. Clearly $f(z)$ is again a primitive nth root of unity for $f \in G$, so $f(z) = z^d$ for some $1 \leq d < n$ with $(d, n) = 1$. Also, $f(b_i)^n = f(b_i^n) = b_i^n$ so that $f(b_i) = b_i z^{t_i}$ for some t_i. Let $G_d = \{f \in G : f(z) = z^d\}$ for each such d so that G is the disjoint union of these G_d. For each $f \in G_d$, let $B_{t,f} = \{i \in I : f(b_i) = b_i z^t\}$ and write

$$C_{t,f} = \sum_{i \in B_{t,f}} k_i b_i$$

for $t = 1, \ldots, n$. Then the linear dependence equation is just

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n} C_{t,f} = 0.$$

Apply f r times to get,

$$f^r(C_{t,f}) = C_{t,f} z^{t+dt+\ldots+d^{r-1}t}.$$

Thus, for each r,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n} C_{t,f}(z^t)^{1+d+\ldots+d^{r-1}} = 0. \tag{7}$$

We can also apply complex conjugation. Since each $C_{t,f}$ is real we get, for each r,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n} C_{t,f}(z^t)^{-(1+d+\cdots+d^{r-1})} = 0. \tag{8}$$

With the notation of Lemma 2.1 we may write (7) and (8) as

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n} C_{t,f}(z^t)^{\phi^r(0)} = 0, \quad \sum_{t=1}^{n} C_{t,f}(z^t)^{i(\phi^r(0))} = 0$$

respectively. Each of these operations can be applied repeatedly. Lemma 2.1 then implies

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n} C_{t,f}(z^t)^k = 0$$

for each $k \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$. Let C be the column vector $(C_{1,f}, \ldots, C_{n-1,f}, C_{n,f})^T$. Thus, we have the matrix equation $VC = 0$ where 0 is the column vector of zeros of size n and V is the Vandermonde matrix with (i, j) entry

$$v_{i,j} = (z^{i-1})^j = z^{j(i-1)}.$$

This matrix is the well-known discrete Fourier transform [14, Chapter 2] and $|\det(V)|^2 = n^n$. So it is invertible and $C = V^{-1}VC = V^{-1}0 = 0$. Thus for each t, we have $C_{t,f} = 0$. Minimality of B implies that for some t, $I = B_{t,f}$. Let i_1, i_2 be any two distinct elements of I. From

$$f\left(\frac{b_{i_1}}{b_{i_2}}\right) = \frac{f(b_{i_1})}{f(b_{i_2})} = \frac{b_{i_1} z^t}{b_{i_2} z^t} = \frac{b_{i_1}}{b_{i_2}}$$

we have that b_{i_1}/b_{i_2} is fixed by f. Now i_1, i_2 are independent of f and d so that b_{i_1}/b_{i_2} is in the fixed field K of G, say $b_{i_1}/b_{i_2} = k$. Thus $1 \cdot b_{i_1} - k \cdot b_{i_2} = 0$ and $\{b_{i_1}, b_{i_2}\}$ is linearly dependent, contradicting the assumed pairwise linear independence of A. So, in fact, A is linearly independent over K. ☐

3 Generalization to arbitrary fields

We next consider the case where the fields $K \subseteq L$ may not be real. For example, let $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $L = \mathbb{Q}(A)$ for $A = \{1, \omega, \omega^2\}$, the cube roots of unity. Then A is pairwise linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ but satisfies $1 + \omega + \omega^2 = 0$.

For another illustrative example, consider the field $K = \mathbb{Z}_p(x)$ of rational functions in x over $\mathbb{Z}_p$, the field of integers mod p. Let $A = \{1, x^{1/p}, (x+1)^{1/p}\}$. As we shall see, A is pairwise linearly independent over K and clearly, for each a in A, a^p is in K. Also, $1 + x^{1/p} - (x+1)^{1/p} = 0$ so A is linearly dependent over K. Note that $(1 + x^{1/p})^p = 1 + x = ((1+x)^{1/p})^p$ but pth roots are unique as $\mathrm{char}(K) = p$. To see the pairwise linear independence of A, suppose for example that $\{1, x^{1/p}\}$ is linearly dependent. (The other cases are similar.) So we have $f(x)^p = xg(x)^p$ for some $f(x), g(x) \in K$ with $g(x)$ not the zero polynomial. Let $f(x) = \sum c_n x^n$. Then $f(x)^p = \sum c_n^p x^{np}$. Similarly if $g(x) = \sum d_n x^n$ then $g(x)^p = \sum d_n^p x^{np}$. Thus $\sum d_n^p x^{np+1} - c_n x^{np} = 0$ and x is algebraic over $\mathbb{Z}_p$, a contradiction.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We begin as before. Suppose, for a contradiction, that A is linearly dependent over K. Let B be a subset of A that is linearly dependent over K and minimal in cardinality with this property. Let $B = \{b_i : i \in I\}$. As before, B has at least 3 elements. Let $K(B) \subseteq L$ be the subfield of L generated by the elements of B over K. Let M be the splitting field of

$$\prod_{i \in I} \left(x^{n_{b_i}} - b_i^{n_{b_i}}\right)$$

over K. Let $n = \mathrm{lcm}\{n_{b_i}\}_{i \in I}$. We must have $n \geqslant 2$ since B is pairwise linearly independent and has more than one element. We see that M is also the splitting field of $x^n - 1$ over $K(B)$. As a splitting field, M is normal over both K and $K(B)$. If $\mathrm{char}(K) = 0$ then M is also separable over both K and $K(B)$. If $\mathrm{char}(K) = p$ then note that, since $(p, n) = 1$ (recall condition (v) in the definition of $\theta(K, L)$), each factor $x^{n_{b_i}} - b_i^{n_{b_i}}$ is coprime to its formal derivative $n_{b_i} x^{n_{b_i} - 1}$ and so is separable. Thus $M : K$ and $M : K(B)$ are separable and both $M : K$ and $M : K(B)$ are Galois. Let z be a primitive nth root of unity. We have the initial linear relation

$$\sum_{i \in I} k_i b_i = 0 \tag{9}$$

where no k_i is 0. We consider separately the cases $n = 2$ and $n > 2$.

Case $n = 2$. Let $f \in \mathrm{Gal}(M : K)$. For each i, $f(b_i)^2 = f(b_i^2) = b_i^2$ so $f(b_i) = c_i b_i$ with $c_i = \pm 1$. If for some i_1, $i_2 \in I$, we have $f(b_{i_1}) = b_{i_1}$ and $f(b_{i_2}) = -b_{i_2}$ then, applying f to (9) and adding the result to (9), we obtain

$$\sum_{i \in I} (1 + c_i) k_i b_i = 0$$

and since $1 + c_{i_1} = 2 \neq 0$ and $1 + c_{i_2} = 0$ we have a contradiction to the minimality of the cardinality of B. So for each f we have that either $f(b_i) = b_i$ for all i or that $f(b_i) = -b_i$ for all i. Then for any i_1, $i_2 \in I$, f fixes b_{i_1}/b_{i_2} and hence this ratio is in the fixed field, contradicting the pairwise linear independence of A as in Theorem 1.1.

Case $n > 2$. In this case z is not an element of L by assumption. The extension $M : K(B)$ is cyclotomic and $\mathrm{Gal}(M : K(B))$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_n^*$. Thus there is an element j of $\mathrm{Gal}(M : K(B))$ for which $j(z) = z^{-1}$. We see that j fixes $K(B)$ and hence K, so $j \in \mathrm{Gal}(M : K)$ too. Now follow the proof of Theorem 1.1 but, instead of using complex conjugation, use the map j to obtain the Vandermonde matrix V and demonstrate the equation $VC = 0$. Again, $|\det(VV^T)| = n^n$ and this is non-zero since n is non-zero in K. The rest of the proof follows as before. ☐

Proof of Theorem 1.3. This proof begins as in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Suppose, for a contradiction, that A has a subset B, linearly dependent over K, of minimal cardinality and indexed by I for $|I| \geqslant 3$. Let M be the splitting field of

$$\prod_{i \in I} \left(x^{n_{b_i}} - b_i^{n_{b_i}} \right)$$

over K. As in Theorem 1.2, $M : K$ must be Galois. The linear relation for B is $\sum_{i \in I} k_i b_i = 0$ with $k_i \neq 0$. Put $n = \mathrm{lcm}\{n_{b_i}\}_{i \in I}$ and let z be a primitive nth root of unity. Then z is in K. This requires a short argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Thus, for any $f \in \mathrm{Gal}(M : K)$ we have $f(z) = z$. As in Theorem 1.1, set $B_{t,f} = \{i \in I : f(b_i) = b_i z^t\}$ and write $C_{t,f} = \sum_{i \in B_{t,f}} k_i b_i$ for $t = 1, \ldots, n$. We have $\sum_{t=1}^{n} C_{t,f} = 0$ and Applying f repeatedly shows that, for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{t=1}^{n} C_{t,f} (z^t)^r = 0.$$

This leads directly to the matrix equation $VC = 0$ (Lemma 2.1 is not required) and the proof continues as in Theorem 1.2. ☐

4 Applications

We give some applications of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.

Proposition 4.1. *There are no solutions to (4) satisfying (5) and (6).*

Proof. Suppose that we do have a solution to (4) satisfying (5) and (6). Take $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $A = \{x_1^{q_1}, \ldots, x_n^{q_n}\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. To apply Theorem 1.1 and obtain a contradiction, we need only to prove that $A \in \theta(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R})$ which reduces quickly to showing that all pairs in A are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. If $x_1^{r_1/s_1}$ and $x_2^{r_2/s_2}$ are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{Q}$, for example, then it follows that we have $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(m_1, m_2) = 1$ and

$$m_1 x_1^{r_1/s_1} = m_2 x_2^{r_2/s_2}.$$

Hence

$$m_1^{s_1 s_2} x_1^{r_1 s_2} = m_2^{s_1 s_2} x_2^{r_2 s_1}.$$

Recalling that $(x_1, x_2) = 1$ we see that

$$m_1^{s_1 s_2} = x_2^{r_2 s_1}, \;\; x_1^{r_1 s_2} = m_2^{s_1 s_2}$$

from which we deduce that $x_1^{r_1/s_1} = \pm m_2$ and $x_2^{r_2/s_2} = \pm m_1$, contradicting our assumption in (6) that $x_i^{q_i} \notin \mathbb{Z}$. ☐

In Proposition 4.1 the condition in (6), that the x_is be pairwise relatively prime, may be weakened a good deal and $\mathbb{Q}$ replaced by more general fields. This is the content of Proposition 4.2 below. For the next two results we set things up as follows. Let K, L be fields with $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq K \subseteq L$ and let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_r\}$ be a subset of L such that for every x_i there is some $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$ (which we assume minimal) with $x_i^{n_i} \in K$. Suppose that X has the property that

$$x_1^{e_1} x_2^{e_2} \cdots x_r^{e_r} \in K$$

for any $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ implies $n_i | e_i$ for all i with $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. Finally, we assume that either (i) $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ or (ii) K contains all n_ith roots of unity for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. Then we have the following.

Proposition 4.2 (Besicovitch, Mordell)**.** *The $n_1 n_2 \cdots n_r$ elements $x_1^{v_1} x_2^{v_2} \cdots x_r^{v_r}$ with $0 \leqslant v_i < n_i$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$ are linearly independent over K.*

Proof. With Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 we need only to show that

$$A = \{x_1^{v_1} x_2^{v_2} \cdots x_r^{v_r}\}_{0 \leqslant v_i < n_i} \in \theta(K, L).$$

Again this reduces to proving the pairwise linear independence of elements of A over K. Take two distinct elements of A,

$$a_1 = x_1^{u_1} x_2^{u_2} \cdots x_r^{u_r}, \ a_2 = x_1^{v_1} x_2^{v_2} \cdots x_r^{v_r}.$$

If $k_1 a_1 + k_2 a_2 = 0$ for $k_1, k_2 \in K$ then

$$x_1^{u_1 - v_1} x_2^{u_2 - v_2} \cdots x_r^{u_r - v_r} \in K$$

and, by assumption, we have $n_i | (u_i - v_i)$ for each i. It follows that $a_1 = a_2$ and this contradiction shows that A is pairwise linearly independent over K. Hence $A \in \theta(K, L)$ and the proof is complete. □

As pointed out in [10], Proposition 4.2 was also proved by Hasse in the case where K contains all n_ith roots of unity.

Proposition 4.3 (Besicovitch, Mordell)**.** *With the same notation and conditions in place we also have*

$$[K(x_1, \dots, x_r) : K] = n_1 n_2 \cdots n_r.$$

Proof. With Proposition 4.2 we have $[K(x_1, \dots, x_r) : K] \geqslant n_1 n_2 \cdots n_r$. Standard results from field theory show the opposite inequality. □

Very simple proofs of the above result in the case of adjoining square roots are available, see [15, 16]. Fried in [6] also shows a special case of Proposition 4.3 and uses it to give a formula for the degree of

$$1 + 2^{1/2} + 3^{1/3} + \cdots + n^{1/n}$$

over $\mathbb{Q}$, answering a question of Sierpiński.

Another result, based on Theorem 1.1, is the following.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $r_i > 0$ be roots of rationals (i.e. $r_i^{n_i} \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$) for i in a finite indexing set I. Suppose*

$$\sum_{i \in I} q_i r_i = q \in \mathbb{Q} \tag{10}$$

for positive rationals q_i. Then each r_i is rational.

Proof. Partition $R = \{r_i : i \in I\}$ into subsets R_k for $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n$ such that if $\{r, r'\} \subseteq R_k$ then $\{r, r'\}$ is linearly dependent over $\mathbb{Q}$ and if r, r' are in distinct subsets R_k, R_l then $\{r, r'\}$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let m_k be minimal in each R_k. Then $M = \{m_k : 1 \leqslant k \leqslant n\}$ is pairwise linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ and hence, with Theorem 1.1, linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. But, using (10), the linear dependence of elements of R_k and the positivity of q_i, r_i, there exist positive rationals $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$ such that $\sum Q_k m_k = q$. Therefore $\sum Q_k m_k + (-q) \cdot 1 = 0$ and $\{1\} \cup M$ is linearly dependent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Hence it is not pairwise linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ and some m_k is rational. Without loss of generality we assume $k = 1$, reordering if necessary. Then

$$\sum_{k=2}^{n} Q_k m_k = q - Q_1 m_1 \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

If $n \geqslant 2$ then we may apply the same reasoning to show another m_k is rational, contradicting the pairwise linear independence of M. So we must have $n = 1$ and $R = R_1$ is pairwise linearly dependent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Since $m_1 \in R$ is rational, it follows that all the r_i are rational. $\square$

Finally, we examine how Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 can be used to obtain linearly independent sets in finite fields. Let $GF(p^u)$ denote the finite field with p^u elements. If a finite field is contained in another, they necessarily have the form $GF(p^u) \subseteq GF(p^v)$ with $u|v$. Let $m = |GF(p^u)^*| = p^u - 1$ and $n = |GF(p^v)^*| = p^v - 1$. We put

$$l = \frac{n}{m} = \frac{p^v - 1}{p^u - 1} = p^{u(v/u-1)} + p^{u(v/u-2)} + \cdots + p^u + 1. \tag{11}$$

The next result uses the well-known fact that the multiplicative group of a finite field is cyclic.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose $GF(p^u) \subseteq GF(p^v)$ and $\phi : GF(p^v)^* \to \mathbb{Z}_n$ is an isomorphism. Suppose also that $m > 1$ and $m|l$. If the positive divisors of m are $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_r\}$ then*

$$A = \phi^{-1}\left(\left\{\frac{d_1 l}{m}, \frac{d_2 l}{m}, \dots, \frac{d_r l}{m}\right\}\right)$$

is linearly independent over $GF(p^u)$.

Proof. Note first that $\phi(GF(p^u)^*) = \langle l \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$. We verify that $A \in \theta(GF(p^u), GF(p^v))$. Conditions *(i)*, *(ii)* are clear. If x is an element of $GF(p^v)^*$ then $x^{n_x} \in GF(p^u)$ if and only if $l | n_x \phi(x)$. It follows that

$$n_x = \frac{l}{(l, \phi(x))}. \tag{12}$$

Thus condition *(iii)* holds for all elements of $GF(p^v)$. For *(iv)* we can verify that $x, y \in GF(p^v)^*$ are linearly independent over $GF(p^u)$ if and only if $\phi(x) \not\equiv \phi(y) \mod l$. To check *(v)* we need to know that $(p, n_x) = 1$ for all $x \in A$. Use (12) to see that $n_x | l$ and (11) to see that $l \equiv 1 \mod p$. Thus $(p, n_x) = 1$, in fact, for all $x \in GF(p^v)^*$. With all this $\phi^{-1}(A) \in \theta(GF(p^u), GF(p^v))$.

We would like to use Theorem 1.2 or 1.3 to finish the proof. It may be seen that $GF(p^v)$ contains a kth root of unity if and only if $(n, k) > 1$. Since

$$(n, n_x) = \left(n, \frac{l}{(l, \phi(x))}\right)$$

and $l|n$ we cannot expect that $GF(p^v)$ does not contain n_xth roots of unity. So Theorem 1.2 will not apply. To use Theorem 1.3 we require $GF(p^u)$ to contain all n_xth roots of unity for all x with $\phi(x) \in A$. If ζ is a kth root of unity then $\zeta^k = 1$ and $n | k\phi(\zeta)$. We see that all k kth roots of unity are in $GF(p^v)$ if and only if $k|n$ since they are

$$\phi^{-1}\left(\left\{0, \frac{n}{k}, \frac{2n}{k}, \dots, \frac{(k-1)n}{k}\right\}\right).$$

Clearly these are contained in $GF(p^u)$ if $l|(n/k)$ or, in other words, $k|m$. Therefore, with (12), $GF(p^u)$ contains all n_xth roots of unity if

$$\frac{l}{(l, \phi(x))} \text{ divides } m.$$

Thus we require that

$$\frac{l}{(l, dl/m)} \text{ divides } m \tag{13}$$

for all divisors d of m. Since m also divides l we have $(l, dl/m) = dl/m$. Then (13) is easily verified and the proof is complete. $\square$

For example $GF(3^2) \subseteq GF(3^{16})$ and we have $m = 8$, $n = 3^{16} - 1$ and $l = 5,380,840 = 8 \cdot w$ for $w = 672,605$. If $\phi : GF(3^{16})^* \to \mathbb{Z}_n$ is any isomorphism then Proposition 4.5 implies that $\phi^{-1}(\{w, 2w, 4w, 8w\})$ is a subset of $GF(3^{16})$ with 4 elements that is linearly independent over $GF(3^2)$. Of course there exists a set of $|GF(3^{16})/GF(3^2)| = 3^{14}$ such elements, but A was found using only pairwise linear independence and that $GF(3^2)$ contains all 8th roots of unity.

Acknowledgements. We thank Gautam Chinta and Nikolaos Diamantis for their generous help with this project.

References

[1] C. D. Bennett, A. M. W. Glass, and G. J. Székely. Fermat's last theorem for rational exponents. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 111:322–329, 2004.

[2] A. S. Besicovitch. On the linear independence of fractional powers of integers. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 15:3–6, 1940.

[3] J. H. Conway and A. J. Jones. Trigonometric Diophantine equations (on vanishing sums of roots of unity). *Acta Arith.*, 30:229–240, 1976.

[4] Z. D. Dai, X. N. Feng, and K. R. Yu. Integral solutions of $x^{1/n} + y^{1/n} = z^{1/n}$ and the degrees $[\mathbb{Q}(p_1^{1/n}, p_2^{1/n}, \ldots, p_r^{1/n}) : \mathbb{Q}]$ (Chinese). *Kexue Tongbao*, 24(10):438–442, 1979.

[5] J. Evertse. The number of solutions of linear equations in roots of unity. *Acta Arith.*, 89(1):45–51, 1999.

[6] E. Fried. On linear combinations of roots (Hungarian). *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Fiz. Oszt. Kösl.*, 3:155–162, 1954.

[7] K. Ireland and M. Rosen. *A classical introduction to modern number theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2nd edition, 1990.

[8] A. Laradji. A generalization of Fermat's last theorem. *Technical Report Series, King Fahd Univ. of Petroleum & Minerals*, TR291, April 2003.

[9] H. B. Mann. On linear relations between roots of unity. *Mathematika*, 12:107–117, 1965.

[10] J. L. Mordell. On the linear independence of algebraic numbers. *Pacific J. Math.*, 3:625–630, 1953.

[11] T. Nagell. Bestimmung des Grades gewisser relativ-algebraischer Zahlen (German). *Monatsh. Math. Phys.*, 48:61–74, 1939.

[12] M. Newman. A radical Diophantine equation. *J. Number Theory*, 13:495–498, 1981.

[13] R. Obláth. Quelques propriétés arithmétiques des radicaux (Hungarian). In *Comptes Rendus du Premier Congrés des Mathématiciens Hongrois, 27 Août–2 Septembre 1950*, pages 445–450. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1952.

[14] K. Ramamohan and P. Yip. *The transformation and data compression handbook*. CRC Press, 2001.

[15] I. Richards. An application of Galois theory to elementary arithmetic. *Adv. in Math.*, 13:268–273, 1974.

[16] R. L. Roth. On extensions of $\mathbb{Q}$ by square roots. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 78:392–393, 1971.

[17] C. L. Siegel. Algebraische Abhängigkeit von Wurzeln (German). *Acta Arith.*, 21:59–64, 1972.

[18] D. Tomescu and F. Vulpescu-Jalea. On the Fermat's equation with rational exponents. *Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math R. S. Roumanie*, 34(82):187–192, 1990.

Richard Carr
349, Riverside Mansions, Milk Yard, Wapping, London, E1W 3SU, UK.

Cormac O'Sullivan
Department of Mathematics, Bronx Community College, Univ. Ave and W 181 St., Bronx, NY 10453, USA.
e-mail: cormac12@juno.com